

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7-11 and 17-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, and 26 are amended. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed August 5, 2008 is addressed hereinafter, in order of appearance.

Claims 1, 7-8, 11 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Brett_Tabke (“The Google FAQ by Webmasters for Webmasters”, http://referencementweb.hautefort.com/files/google_kbase.pdf, 4/23/2002 in view of Bookface-ga (“Search Term Suggestion Tool available”, <http://answers.google.com/answers/threadview?id=18072>, May 25, 2002) and further in view of Gravano et al. (US Patent 7,146,358). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For convenient reference, Claim 1 is repeated below.

1. A method for generating a list of candidate alternative spellings, comprising:
finding, among a **plurality of pages**, a **first page** that contains a link that indicates a first spelling that is also contained in a query that was entered by a user, **wherein said link links to a second page**;
searching, within said second page, for any spellings that satisfy particular criteria; wherein said particular criteria includes that said spellings are spelled similarly to, but not exactly the same as, said first spelling;
adding, to a list of candidate alternative spellings of said first spelling, **all spellings within said second document** that satisfy said particular criteria;
generating a **filtered list** at least in part by filtering said list of candidate alternative spellings based on a comparison of (a) a first frequency of occurrences of said first spelling **in said plurality of pages** to (b) a second frequency of occurrences, in said plurality of pages, of a second spelling from said list of candidate alternative spellings; and
storing said filtered list on a computer-readable storage medium (emphasis added).

Claim 11 has been amended to recite similar subject matter. As noted above, Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “finding, among a plurality of pages, a first page that contains, in a body of the first page, **a link that indicates** a first spelling that is also contained in a query that was entered

by a user, wherein said link links to a second page” (emphasis added). In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action (page 4) misquotes the claim language by leaving out the above terms shown in **bold**, which may have contributed to the defective nature of the rejection.

The Office Action asserts (page 4) that this portion of the Claim is shown within Brett_Tabke’s page 10 “url” search. Applicant believes the Office Action is referring to the “inurl:WebmasterWorld” command line operation. Brett_Tabke’s “inurl:” command line operation may return (ostensibly the claimed “finding”) a web page having a URL including the specific spelling entered by a user. However, such an assertion is invalid based on how Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to more explicitly recite “in a body of the first page, a link that indicates a first spelling . . .”. It is important to not confuse body of a page with the URL of a page. Brett_Tabke’s first spelling would be in the URL of a page only, but by no means would be in the body of that page, as claimed. Thus, finding a web page having a URL including the specific spelling entered by a user is not what Applicant is claiming.

Next, Brett_Tabke does not make any suggestion that a page found by using the “inurl:” command line operation would have the following claimed features “wherein said link links to a second page”. Indeed, a URL returned by such a command line operation may not contain any links whatsoever, thus may not link to anything, and indeed may not be a link itself, as the URL itself could be invalid.

Next, Claim 1 also recites, inter alia, “adding, to a list of candidate alternative spellings of said first spelling, all spellings within said second document that satisfy said particular criteria”. However, the Office Action did not specify where any “adding” occurs within Brett_Tabke.

In rejecting this portion of Claim 1, the Office Action (page 4) relied upon Brett_Tabke’s “page 12, misspelling and no results, redirect to the suggested spelling” as well as “page 18, keyword suggestion”. However, it is important to note the sequence by which the steps of Claim

1 occur. The step of adding cannot occur until after the claimed step of “finding . . . a **first** page . . . that contains a spelling . . . in a query that was entered by a user”. Without knowing the claimed “first spelling . . . that was entered by the user”, it is impossible to add to “a list of candidate alternative spellings of [that] first spelling”.

Meanwhile, in sharp contrast, Brett_Tabke’s suggested spelling page is built (the claimed “added to”) entirely without any input from the claimed user, and indeed is already built before the user ever arrives to begin a query. Brett_Tabke is completely silent on how the suggested spelling page is built, but Brett_Tabke is clear that the suggested spelling page is in existence *prior to* being encountered by Brett_Tabke’s user, thus Brett_Tabke is out of sequence with Claims 1 and 11. It is also clear that Brett_Tabke’s user does not have input or control over the suggested spelling page, and certainly that user’s input is never “added to” anything within the suggested spelling page, as claimed.

That completes the page 12 portion of the rejection of this claimed step. Moving onto the page 18 portion, Brett_Tabke’s keyword suggestions are used to assist a website developer in increasing traffic to a particular website. These keyword suggestions are never described as being added to any list, as claimed, nor is there any suggestion of the keyword suggestions satisfying particular criteria, again as claimed. Thus, the rejection is unclear, and clarification is respectfully requested.

It is possible the Office Action is suggesting that the keyword suggestions are part of a list, and Brett_Tabke’s suggestion to choose specific keywords from empty categories is a type of “adding to” this list of keywords. Further, it is possible the Office Action is suggesting that a user pick the particular misspellings of a key expression, and add those misspellings to that list. However, such an interpretation still does not explain what part of Brett_Tabke corresponds with the claimed “all spellings within said second document that satisfy said particular criteria”.

Additionally, a separate part of Claim 1 recites that the particular criteria include spellings that are “spelled similarly to, **but not exactly the same as**, said first spelling” (emphasis added). It would be an extremely illogical use of a list of website keywords to intentionally not contain the correct spelling of a search term.

For at least the above reasons, the rejections of Claims 1 and 11, as well as all claims dependent therefrom, are unsupportable and should be withdrawn. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on their incorporation of limitations from the Independent claims, as well as additional limitations that distinguish over cited art. Further, the dependent claims introduce additional features that render them patentable over the prior art. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, separate arguments are not provided at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by e-mail or telephone

///

///

if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. As per MPEP Chapter 5, Applicant acknowledges that Internet communications may not be secure.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

/christophermtanner#41518/

Dated: November 5, 2008

Christopher M. Tanner
Reg. No. 41,518

ctanner@hptb-law.com
2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1238
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076